

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 26, 2003, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 26, 2003. Claims 1-36 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 32-36 have been cancelled without prejudice by Applicant. Claims 1-31 have been considered by the Examiner and stand rejected. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.


Applicants confirm election of claims 1-31 of Group I, drawn to a method and classified in class 427, subclass 569.

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,491,978. Applicant respectfully responds to this rejection. Applicants have enclosed a terminal disclaimer and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The prior art made of record is noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, it is believed that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not deemed necessary for a full and complete response to this office action. Accordingly, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the claimed aspects of the invention. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)